

SLDC, Public Review Draft, Public Comments

Date Comment	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Communication	Part of County	Chapter	Comment/Question
10/9/2012	Lynn		Pickard	Web			The Santa Fe County Sustainable Growth Management Plan contained a lot of aspirational material encouraging (and seeming to mandate) that land use development would require accommodations for bicycling, either in bicycle paths or roads that were bicycle friendly. I don't see anything in the Sustainable Land Development Code that would translate this aspirational language into specific requirements. Without specific requirements, I fear that development will be approved in a business-as-usual manner without considering the benefits that bicycling and pedestrian infrastructure can provide, and will thus be inconsistent with the SGMP. The language at the beginning of the Code requiring that new development reflect transportation networks and provide a framework for interconnectivity is virtually meaningless and seems to allow development to continue as it has in the past, rather than to incorporate new requirements as the SGMP seemed to promise. Remaining references to bicycles in the Code appear to be definitional and/or permissive.
10/10/2012				comment form	El Norte		I would like to see the Nambe area remain a residential area only to exclude small businesses e.g. welding shops.
10/10/2012	Amrit	Khalsa		comment form	El Norte	7	Water harvesting requirements are excessive and expensive.
10/10/2012	Amrit	Khalsa		comment form	El Norte	7	Certified Energy audit for residential uses will add a high expense and backlog to new structure [approval].
10/10/2012	Joe	Martinez		comment form	El Norte		I would like to recommend that Santa Fe County enforce rules pertaining to certain types of businesses located in rural residential parts of the county-- especially when it comes to issuing permits.

Date Comment	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Communication	Part of County	Chapter	Comment/Question
10/10/2012	Ross	Lockridge		email	The South	10	<p>We agree that sand & gravel operations should generally be required to pave dirt roads leading from their mining operations. When finally the road from the edge of the Cerrillos district was paved to the RR tracks, that brought relief from a major dust problem. (As we recall, citizens had to raise some dust to get the paving done.) But the caravan of trucks remained as an unhealthy impact (day-long diesel & noise) along paved roads in the greater community. A family in the Silver Hills area continued to report fine white dust silica seeping into their home a mile away from the site. One thing concerning sand & gravel that we will probably need to reiterate is that as much as we might like the idea of a mom & pop operation, what we learned during the drafting of the SGMP was that there actually were none as they couldn't compete against the larger companies. There's much to be said, and we wish we didn't have to re-argue things that we thought settled in the "constitution" (SGMP). But concerning sand & gravel, we would encourage the BCC to direct staff to cut that weak sand & gravel 2-page section (a weakened version of the current Article XI) with a listing of DCI's as was done with oil and gas and subject to the mining ordinance. Note that strangely other related items that are DCIs in the SGMP have been pulled out and placed in this weak PRD section.</p> <p>One last thing, staff is directed in the SGMP 2.2.6.2., as follows: "The mining ordinance should be incorporated into the SLDC without substantial changes, although it is expected that some aspects of the oil and gas ordinance may also be made applicable to mining. " In general an amending of this ordinance will need to be watched closely and we hope the concept "strength don't weaken" will prevail.</p>